



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.         | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 09/847,063  | 04/30/2001  | Ming Zhou            | GEI-001US 29083             | 4555             |
| 21718   | 7590        | 01/05/2007           |                             |                  |
| LEE & HAYES PLLC<br>SUITE 500<br>421 W RIVERSIDE<br>SPOKANE, WA 99201 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>RUTTEN, JAMES D |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT                    | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 2192                        |                  |

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS                               | 01/05/2007        | ELECTRONIC    |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 01/05/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/847,063

Applicant(s)

ZHOU ET AL.

Examiner

J. Derek Rutten

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55 and 57-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55 and 57-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Applicant's after-final submission filed 11/20/2006, responding to the 7/20/06 Office action which detailed the rejection of claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55, and 57-72. Claims 58 and 70 have been amended. Claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55, and 57-72 remain pending in the application and have been fully considered by the examiner.

#### ***Response to Arguments/Amendments***

2. Applicants' arguments (see pages 13-14, filed 11/20/06) regarding the objection to the oath are persuasive. Therefore, this objection has been withdrawn.

3. Applicants' amendments have obviated the drawing and claim objections, which have been withdrawn.

4. Applicants' arguments, see pages 15-23, filed 11/20/06, with respect to the rejections of claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 49, 52, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made in view of US 6,623,529 to Lakritz.

5. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2192

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 20-24, 26, 32-35, 40, 49, 52, 55, and 57-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,623,529 to Lakritz (hereinafter “Lakritz”).

In regard to claim 20, Lakritz discloses:

*A method (see column 2 lines 28-34) comprising:*

*compiling a computer-servable document written for a particular locale to extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content, the compiling producing a compiled document with locale-independent elements; See column 6 line 66 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “replace this information with appropriate tags...”*

*storing the original locale-sensitive content; see column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. “database.” Also column 7 lines 38-40.*

*substituting a function call in place of associated removed original locale-sensitive content in the compiled document; and See column 7 line 1, e.g. “tags and commands”*

*at runtime, retrieving the compiled document and populating the compiled document with a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content, See column 2 lines 28-34, e.g. “directs the Web server to deliver the appropriate localized content;”*

*wherein the populating comprises executing the function call in the compiled document to obtain the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content and to insert the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content back into the compiled document.* See section 3.6.3.1 “WPReplace” in column 30 at line 61. The WPReplace directs the server to populate the compiled document with locale-sensitive content before serving to the client. Also note column 31 line 3, e.g. “string to be replaced” indicates that the locale-sensitive content is inserted in the compiled document.

In regard to claim 21, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the original locale-sensitive content comprises natural language text.* See column 2 lines 28-34.

In regard to claim 22, the above rejection of claim X is incorporated. 20. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the locale-independent elements comprise source code and formatting data.* See column 7 lines 27-30.

In regard to claim 23, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the storing comprises storing the original locale-sensitive content in a structured text file.* See column 27 lines 23-24.

In regard to claim 24, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the storing comprises storing the original locale sensitive content in a database file.* See column 27 lines 23-24.

In regard to claim 26, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *storing one or more translated versions of the original locale-sensitive content corresponding to one or more respective other locales.* See column 27 lines 26-28.

In regard to claim 32, Lakritz discloses:

*A system (See Fig. 2) comprising:*

*at least one computer-servable document stored in a computer-readable medium, the document being written for a particular locale;* See column 7 lines 28-29, e.g.

*“document.”*

*a compiler to automatically extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content from the document to produce a compiled document containing locale-independent elements,* See column 7 lines 41-42, e.g. *“parser.”*

*wherein the compiler stores the original locale-sensitive content in a data structure separate from the compiled document, and* See column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. *“placed in a ... database.”*

*wherein the compiler substitutes a function call in place of associated removed original locale-sensitive content in the compiled document; See column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “replace...with...tags and commands.”*

*a runtime manager that, prior to serving, populates the compiled document with a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content, See column 2 lines 38-43, e.g. “filling in a document.”*

*wherein the function call is configured such that, when executed at runtime, the function call obtains the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content from the data structure and inserts the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content back into the compiled document. See column 29 lines 62-63, e.g. “replaces a string with its translation.”*

In regard to claims 33 and 34 the above rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 21 and 22, respectively.

In regard to claim 35, the above rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the compiler examines source code in the document to determine, from the source code, whether any original locale-sensitive content is present. See column 7 lines 28-29.*

In regard to claim 40, the above rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the original locale-sensitive content is translated into at least one translated version of the content corresponding to at least one other respective locale.* See column 7 lines 38-40.

In regard to claim 49, Lakritz discloses:

*A system (See Fig. 2) comprising:*

*compilation means for compiling a computer-servable document written for a particular locale to extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content, the compilation means producing a compiled document with locale-independent elements;* See column 7 lines 41-42, e.g. “parser.”

*storage means for storing the original locale-sensitive content extracted from the computer-servable document in a data structure separate from the compiled document,* column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. “placed in a ... database.”

*wherein the compilation means comprises substitution means for substituting a function in place of associated removed original locale-sensitive content in the compiled document, the function representing the associated removed original locale-sensitive content extracted from the compiled document;* See column 6 line 67 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “replace...with...tags and commands.”

*further comprising runtime means for populating, at runtime, the compiled document with a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content to reconstruct the*



Art Unit: 2192

*computer-servable document*, See column 29 lines 62-63, e.g. “replaces a string with its translation.”

*wherein the populating comprises executing the function call in the compiled document to obtain the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content and to insert the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content back into the compiled document.* See section 3.6.3.1 “WPReplace” in column 30 at line 61.

In regard to claim 52, the above rejection of claim 49 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the locale- sensitive content is translated into another version for use in another locale.* See column 7 lines 42-48.

In regard to claim 55, Lakritz discloses:

*One or more computer-readable media comprising computer-executable instructions* (see column 57 line 65 – column 58 line 34) *that, when executed, direct a computer to:*

*examine source code in a document written for a particular locale;* See column 7 lines 28-30, e.g. “identify translatable text.”

*extract and remove characters associated with any original locale-sensitive content from the source code;* See column 6 line 66 – column 7 line 2, e.g. “remove as much country an language-specific information as possible.”

*store the original locale-sensitive content in a separate file; and* see column 5 lines 11-14, e.g. “database.”

*substitute in place of the removed original locale-sensitive content in the document, function calls which, when executed at runtime, re-supply a desired version of the original locale-sensitive content to the document.* See column 6 line 67 - column 7 line 1, e.g. “replace ... with appropriate tags and commands;” also See section 3.6.3.1 “WPReplace” in column 30 at line 61.

In regard to claim 57, the above rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *receiving a request for the computer-servable document, wherein the request contains an identity of a desired locale, the desired locale associated with the desired version of the original locale-sensitive content, wherein the populating comprises, at runtime, executing the function call in the compiled document to obtain the desired version of the associated original locale-sensitive content based on the request;* See column 17 lines 65-67, e.g. “request.”

*and forwarding the computer-servable document with the desired version of the original locale-sensitive content in reply to the request.* See column 17 lines 31-33, e.g. “served.”

In regard to claim 58, the above rejection of claim 57 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the request is a client request received by a server system, via a network.* See column 17 lines 35 and 67, also see column 2 lines 58-60.

In regard to claim 59, the above rejection of claim 58 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the computer-servable document is a web page*. See column 2 lines 19-25.

In regard to claim 60, the above rejection of claim 58 is incorporated. Lakritz further discloses: *wherein the server system implements a multi-layer architecture, wherein the multi-layer architecture comprises a business logic layer for processing the client request according to an associated problem domain*. See Fig. 2., column 4 lines 46-54, e.g. "Visitor module", and column 12 lines 57-61, e.g. "domain."

In regard to claims 61-64, the above rejection of claim 40 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

In regard to claims 65-68, the above rejection of claim 52 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

In regard to claims 69-72, the above rejection of claim 55 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

Art Unit: 2192

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (571)272-3703. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F 6:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jdr



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER